EXHIBIT A

EXCERPT FROM TRANSCRIPT OF JULY 24, 2013 BANKRUPTCY HEARING

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS - WESTERN DIVISION

IN THE MATTER OF:

. Case #12-19882-hjb

NEW ENGLAND COMPOUNDING

PHARMACY, INC.,

Springfield, Massachusetts

. July 24, 2013

Debtor.

. 1:39 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING ON:

(#166) AMENDED APPLICATION OF CHAPTER 11
TRUSTEE TO EMPLOY AND RETAIN HARRIS BEACH PLLC AS SPECIAL
COUNSEL;

(#263) MOTION OF CHAPTER 11 TRUSTEE FOR AN ORDER (I)
ESTABLISHING BAR DATES FOR FILING PROOFS OF CLAIM; (II)
APPROVING CERTAIN ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS AND
PROCEDURES FOR PERSONAL INJURY TORT AND WRONGFUL-DEATH CLAIMS;
(III) APPROVING THE FORM AND MANNER OF NOTICE; AND FOR
ADDITIONAL RELATED RELIEF

BEFORE THE HONORABLE HENRY J. BOROFF

APPEARANCES:

For the Chapter 11

JEFFREY D. STERNKLAR, ESQ.

Trustee, Paul D. Moore: DUANE MORRIS, LLP

100 High Street

24th Floor

Boston, MA 02110

For the

Official Committee of

Unsecured Creditors:

WILLIAM R. BALDIGA, ESQ.

BROWN RUDNICK LLP

One Financial Center

Boston; MA 02111

For the United States

Trustee:

PAULA R.C. BACHTELL, ESQ. OFFICE OF THE U.S. TRUSTEE

5 Post Office Square

Suite 1000

Boston, MA 02109

For PMIC:

RICHARD E. MIKELS, ESQ.

(TELEPHONICALLY)

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND

POPEO PC

One Financial Center Boston, MA 02111

Page 2

For Individual Defendants in the MDL Action:

WILLIAM J. DAILEY, JUNIOR, ESQ. SLOANE AND WALSH LLP Three Center Plaza Boston, MA 02108

For the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee:

THOMAS M. SOBOL, ESQ.

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

55 Cambridge Parkway

Suite 301

Cambridge, MA 02142

For Barry and Lisa Cadden:

HAROLD B. MURPHY, ESQ. MURPHY & KING
One Beacon Street

21st Floor Boston, MA 02108

Electronic Sound Recording Operator: Laura L. Chambers

Proceedings Recorded by Electronic Sound Recording Transcript Produced by Certified Transcription Service ESCRIBERS, LLC

700 West 192nd Street Suite 607, New York, NY 10040 1-973-406 2250; operations@escribers.net

(Proceedings from 3:01 p.m. until 4:13 p.m. not transcribed)

THE COURT: Let me start out by providing my perspective as to the delineation of the job that I have and the job that I think the district court has taken on. And I preface that by reminding those of you that are familiar with the Bankruptcy Code and Title 28 of the United States Code that any time that the district court chooses to do so, it may withdraw the reference from this court and deal with the whole ball of wax. Until and unless it does that, then the following delineation is, I think, what I'm doing and what I think the district court is doing, and the delineation is created not as a result of anyone's choice, as much as it is statutory and constitutional requirements.

The bankruptcy court's job here is to marshal the assets of the estate, to approve a mechanism for distribution of the proceeds of those assets to allowed claims, and to liquidate claims that are neither personal injury nor wrongful death claims. Those are the primary functions of this court. The primary function of the district court, so long as it chooses to do so, as I indicated, is to liquidate the personal injury and the wrongful death claims. Frankly, I think I've got the better of the deal.

The parties differ on whether there needs to be an early bar date for the victims. I agree that there should be, not so much an early but an earlier, relatively speaking, bar

. 15

date. The goal is to get everybody around the table, and I don't think that that can be appropriately done unless the victims are required to file claims.

Now, which victims should that be -- or I should say what persons should that be? And those should be those people who received products that the CDC said were contaminated.

Not everybody that any NECC ever dealt with, and not people who, under any stretch of the imagination might have had some contact with NECC. The CDC has identified the contaminated lots. Those are the people who need the actual notice.

Again, those claims are not going to tell us very much.

They're not going to give us very much information about the ultimate liquidation value of those claims. And if the district court wants to fashion some sort of a secondary notice or to appoint some mediation intermediary in order to resolve these claims, I wouldn't be surprised. But this court's job is to get everybody around the table that should be around the table.

Now, the parties differ as to what the notice intermediaries should -- who they should be. Well, they should be those entities who administered the contaminated product. Again, not everybody who administered any NECC product over a stated period of time. They ought to be required to produce, for the Chapter 11 Trustee -- as well as the PSC, but I leave what should be produced for the PSC to

Page 39

District Judge Saylor. But they ought to produce a list of the names, the addresses, the last four digits of Social Security numbers, so that they can be separately identified for those with similar names, and what was administered to, when, and by whom. I really can't see anything else of value that would be put to good use.

The Chapter 11 Trustee ought to be sending the notices to all of those people, and that list, by each of the notice intermediaries, ought to be supplied in short order. The request for reimbursement for identifying the names of patients, who probably have already been identified to the CDC, has a level of arrogance that I won't even begin to address.

The PITWD -- and I think that the creditors' committee called it something else, but the supplement, again, ought to be extremely limited because of its limited value. The notice should not identify any particular third-party targets. It's enough, it seems to me, if it says to the claimant that your failure to file a claim in the NECC case may affect your rights against parties other than NECC. That ought to be enough to give them a clue as to who those parties might be. And I think being more specific and identifying classes of likely third-party targets paints a target on those entities that is inappropriate.

HIPAA is not a problem. HIPAA contains the

exception for information requested supplied by court order.

In the order that I'm going to ask the Chapter 11 Trustee to

prepare, we'll say that in the Court's view, HIPAA is satisfied by the terms of the order.

5

3

As for these different noticing agents, I think that

6

7 differently than does this court. This is a case here about

the PSC, understandably, views this proceeding much

8

all of the creditors. The victims of these adulterated

. 9

products are clearly the vast majority, and undoubtedly, the

10

most sympathetic. But to have a separate noticing agent for

11

the PSC, whose job it also is to collect claims and deal with

12

plan votes, if that time ever comes, with respect to -- it

13

simply creates confusion if we're going to have secondary

14

notices, one for nonvictims and one for victims.

15

16 change that the Chapter 11 Trustee and the creditors'

17

committee in the bankruptcy case, with the advice of the PSC,

Accordingly, this court is happy to consider any

18

recommends to change noticing agents, in the event that one of

19

them is less expensive than the other. And the parties know

20

how to file a motion seeking to substitute one notice agent

21

for another. But that noticing agent must come from the

22

bankruptcy court, which is responsible for a larger class of

creditors than simply the victims of these adulterated lots.

23

I've already indicated my unwillingness to disrupt

2425

the 503(b)(9) deadline that is addressed in the Local Rules.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 41

Just going down my list of the different issues that were raised, a number of the objections addressed the problem of statutes of limitations that might extend for periods well after the bar date. Well, frankly, that's what bankruptcy is all about. We don't wait for the statute of limitations, because that delays recovery for creditors. Creditors who have claims must state those claims. It's okay that they're unliquidated. It's okay that they're contingent. But they must identify the claims in order to participate with other creditors. Claims filed can always be amended, so long as they're not substantively different. So a creditor who has incurred loss as a result of one of these adulterated lots, and whose illness progressed thereafter, is always free to file an amended claim. And even untimely claims may be allowed under the Pioneer -- the Supreme Court's Pioneer case, in Chapter 11 cases, so long as the failure to file the claim was by virtue of excusable neglect and the estate has not been unduly prejudiced.

And so I have no problem with telling these creditors that in fact if they fail to file a claim they may be barred from doing so thereafter. But rather than using the words "shall be forever barred", I'd either prefer "may be barred", or if "shall be barred" is the choice of the Chapter 11 Trustee, that it be appropriately footnoted with an indication that it may be subject to amendment, and there may

even be an opportunity for later filed claims. See the Pioneer case.

Hold on just a moment. Let me just make sure. Oh, one last thing that I think Mr. Lipton suggested, or perhaps it was Mr. Sobol, that this court may want to have a joint session with the district court. I'm not calling for that. If the district court finds it of value then I can make my way to Boston well enough. But so long as the district court is satisfied that I'm doing the job the way it would prefer, then I'm happy to do that from a distance. I'm happy to do a joint session, if that's what the district court wants, and I'm even happy to -- not happy, but I'm either content to send the file to the district court, if the district court chooses to withdraw the reference. At the moment, I don't see any indication that the district court wishes to do that.

So now, in terms of timing. I'm going to ask the Chapter 11 Trustee to send me a proposed order, ordering the notice intermediaries who administered these adulterated lots identified by the CDC, to supply the names, addresses, last four digits of the Social Security number, what was administered and when, to the trustee on or before August 16. I then would ask the Chapter 11 Trustee and his counsel and counsel for the plaintiff steering committee to sit down and see if they can create a joint list of who it is that ought to get this actual notice.

Then I want the notice to be published ten days after the bar-date order, and then twenty days before the expiration of the order, in each of the newspapers which were listed in the trustee's amended supplemental bar-date motion. It currently reads that the trustee has the option to do that; I would prefer that the trustee be directed to do it.

And I assume that that list is a list of newspapers of general distribution in those places where the drug was administered. If somebody thinks that there ought to be another newspaper, then I'm happy to hear about that, and I would be happy to hear about it on August 22 at 10 a.m. in Springfield. Parties who wish to appear by phone, as they have today, are welcome to do so again.

On August 22, I'm hoping that what I will hear counsel for the PSC and counsel for the Chapter 11 Trustee and counsel for the creditors' committee. What I will hear from them is that they have a list, with which they feel some degree of confidence is a list of all those who received the drugs from the allegedly adulterated lots. The notice intermediaries ought to use their best efforts to produce those names, for no other reason than that, of all the things that I may eventually release them from, I will never agree to release them from their original responsibility to have provided these names to the Chapter 11 Trustee. So they ought to do a good job, for their own sake.

Page 44

So I'm hoping that I will receive the order from the Chapter 11 Trustee by week's end. And again, that's the order to the notice intermediaries to turn over those lists to the Chapter 11 Trustee and counsel for the PSC, in confidence, on or before August 16, and we'll address, again, on August 22 at 10 a.m. what modifications need to be made to the notice that's going to go out to these people and also to the nonvictims. I hope that you'll have for me a proposed revised notice consistent with what I've talked about in the last twenty minutes or so.

Thank you very much.

(End of requested audio at 4:33 p.m.)

* * * * * * * * * *

CERTIFICATION

I, Clara Rubin, the court approved transcriber, do hereby certify the foregoing is a true and correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

2.5

July 25, 2013

DATE